9-12-2005

Philosophies and characteristics of bilingual/bicultural programs of the deaf

Paul Kelly

Philosophies and Characteristics of Bilingual/Bicultural Programs of the Deaf

Master's Thesis/Project

Submitted to the Faculty

of the Master of Science Program in Secondary Education

of Students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

By

Paul R. Kelly

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science

Rochester, New York May , 1997.

Approved_____
(Thesis/Project Advisor)

_____
(Committee Member)

_____
Program Director)

Running head: PHILOSOPHIES & CHARACTERISTICS OF BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL PROGRAMS OF THE DEAF

Philosophies & Characteristics of Bilingual/Bicultural Programs of the Deaf

Paul R. Kelly

Rochester Institute of Technology

Abstract

This study examined the philosophies and characteristics of ten Bilingual/Bicultural Programs of the Deaf in the nation including one in Canada. By means of a survey, five aspects of bilingual/bicultural programs were investigated: (1) demographics of the deaf bilingual/bicultural programs, (2) the roles of American Sign Language (ASL) and English, (3) communication policies, (4) languages in the curriculum, and (5) the program's bilingual/bicultural curriculum. Analysis of the responses revealed that a large percentage of teachers was deaf in bilingual/bicultural programs. American Sign Language was recognized as the most appropriate and accessible language for deaf children and teachers and teacher aids/assistants were expected to use it as the main language of instruction. All programs recognized ASL and English as equal but separate languages.

Philosophies & Characteristics of Bilingual/Bicultural Programs of the Deaf

The bilingual/bicultural (Bi/Bi) approach in educating deaf students emerged in the late 1980s as a result of dissatisfaction with deaf education. As a result of a report submitted by the Commission on Education of the Deaf in 1988, deaf education was considered to be a failure in effectively educating deaf children. Since then, a number of deaf schools across the nation have begun to adopt the philosophy of bilingual/bicultural education. Since the bilingual/bicultural educational approach is rather new, we would expect it to continue its refining process. Unfortunately, because of this, there have been several interpretations which created some confusion and misunderstandings. Some think the approach excludes the use of English and focuses mainly on American Sign Language (ASL) as a tool for teaching. Others think that the approach only uses ASL as a stepping stone to teach the deaf pupils English. These dilemmas led to the need of a study to document what the actual interpretations of bilingual/bicultural approach have been and the characteristics of Bi/Bi programs.

Factors Leading to Development of Bilingual/Bicultural Education Programs for Deaf Children

Originally, the majority of schools for the deaf in the nineteenth century used sign language as a language of instruction (Barnum, 1984). In 1870, 42% of teachers of the deaf were deaf individuals (Jones, 1918). However, in 1880, the

International Congress on Deafness, which was held in Milan, Italy, also known as the Milan Congress, called for oral education in place of sign language with the belief that it would promote speech and language skills. 164 delegates were present and all except five (a British, and four Americans, including the one who was deaf) supported the motion (VanCleve & Crouch, 1989; Barnum, 1984). As a result, the entrance of oral education brought about a dramatic decrease of deaf teachers from 42% in 1870 to 12% in 1960 (Johnson, Liddell & Erting, 1989; Moores, 1987). The oral method became a dominating force in education of the deaf in the late nineteenth through much of the twentieth century. However, it gradually lost its luster in the 1960s and 1970s due to a number of factors. The Babbidge Report in 1965, and a report presented by the Commission of Education of the Deaf (COED) in 1988 were the two federal reports which paved the way for the emergence of Bilingual/Bicultural educational programs across the nation. These two reports revealed that current deaf educational methods were failing to educate deaf children effectively. The Babbidge Report released in 1965 by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW revealed an unsatisfactory state of the education of the deaf (Scouten, 1984). This report renewed interest in efforts to improve the education of deaf students.

Another factor was a general dissatisfaction with the oral method which failed to help profoundly deaf students who were either born deaf or became deaf before they acquired language (Lou, 1988). Also, the number of postlingually deaf students

decreased due to better medical treatments, such as antibiotics in dealing with diseases that caused deafness which were prevalent in nineteenth and early twentieth century (Scouten, 1984; Lou, 1988).

In the 1960s, American Sign Language (ASL) grew in its acceptance and recognition as a language. It was formerly thought to be unanalyzable and was considered to lack internal structure (Lou, 1988; Valli & Lucas, 1992). In the 1960s, William C. Stokoe made a breakthrough in proving that ASL was a language that could be analyzed (Valli & Lucas, 1992). Additional studies, such as the one by Stuckless and Birch (1966), revealed that deaf children of deaf parents who used sign language had better academic success than those of hearing parents.

As a result, total communication (sign language and spoken language used together) emerged in late 1960s. In 1968, Roy Holcomb, who was a deaf supervisor in a deaf education program in southern California, initiated a total communication method (Hurwitz, 1987). Its philosophy was described by Margaret S. Kent, a principal of Maryland School for the Deaf, as "the right of every deaf child to learn to use all forms of communication so that he may have full opportunity to develop language competence at the earliest possible age" (Gannon, 1981, p.369). In 1976, the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf officially defined total communication as "a philosophy requiring the incorporation of appropriate aural, manual, and oral modes of communication in order to insure effective

communication with and among hearing impaired persons" (p. 369). This reopened the doors to sign language in nearly every school for the deaf. By 1977, 70% of the schools for the deaf used total communication (Jensema and Trybus, 1978; Gannon, 1981). However, Gannon (1981) stated that many teachers did not sign well nor make much effort to learn. Barnum (1984) added that when total communication became a method to educate deaf students, it was thought to be a combination of ASL and oral methods but it ended up to be a combination of Signing Exact English (SEE) and oral method. Many manual codes of English, such as Seeing Essential English (SEE I), Signing Exact English (SEE II), Signed English (SE), and Cued Speech (CS), were also developed as an attempt to educate deaf students effectively (Lou, 1988). Nover (1995) stated that these codes were developed by those who were not experts in linguistics and sociolinguistics. These codes were not considered to be natural languages by the linguistic researchers. According to Nover, they did not reflect the sociolinguistics of the deaf community. Though the deaf educational programs using codes were met with skepticism and criticisms for their effectiveness, Stewart (1993) argued that this was due to the fact that the majority of teachers were not using MCE effectively. He added that the schools poorly implemented communication policies, and thus failed to monitor the use of signs in classes.

With the Bilingual Education Act (P.L. 89-10, Title VII, 1965, as amended 1968) in place, bilingual educational programs emerged across the nation to provide the use of minority

languages to help minority children to become proficient in English (Lane, 1991). Cummins (1979), who has done intensive research on the bilingual education of minority children, strongly maintained that the proficiency in a second language (L2) depends upon the child's proficiency in his/her first language (L1). He emphasized that with a strong base in L1 and the use of L1 as the language of instruction, proficiency in L2 would develop successfully. The principles of the Bilingual Education Act and Cummins' research were noted by Bilingual/ Bicultural advocates in deaf education. They applied these principles to English language acquisition and educational achievement of deaf children. The use of ASL as the language of instruction with deaf children was believed to provide them with a first language base, cognitive skills, and academic skills. Thus, early acquisition and use of ASL would enable them to develop proficiency in English (L2) (Barnum, 1984; Johnson, Liddell, & Erting, 1989; Paul & Quigley, 1994; Strong, 1988). Kuntze and Bosso (1991) added that Dr. Ellen Schneiderman and Dr. David McKee, professors of California State University of Northridge (CSUN), stated that the use of ASL to teach any subject enables the Deaf students to comprehend concepts more readily than other methods which are currently used.

Despite the good intentions of educators using total communication as a tool to educate deaf students, another blow came upon them in 1988. The second federal report, a report presented by the Commission on Education of the Deaf (COED) in

1988, also labeled the deaf education system as a failure (COED, 1988; Nover, 1995). Paul (1988) stated:

> Since the 1970's, most deaf students have been educated in Total Communication programs in which some form of signing and speech is used simultaneously for communication and instructional purposes. Despite improvement in development of tests, early amplification, and the implementation of early intervention or preschool programs, most students are still functionally illiterate upon graduation from high school. (p. 3)

Swisher (1989) added that though lip-reading and the use of hearing aids are beneficial in certain ways, deaf students still receive fragmented linguistic input.

Nover (1995) expressed that educators historically looked upon deaf people from an audist and pathological point of view. With the thought that English is a dominant language, they devalued ASL, feeling that it would prevent deaf students from learning English as their first language and from integrating with the hearing community. They considered the use and teaching of ASL as putting Deaf people at a social, economical, and educational disadvantage. Nover maintained that educators failed to see that natural language acquisition for deaf children is a visual/spatial language-ASL, which can facilitate their learning English as a second language. Swisher (1989) pointed out that the belief that ASL would hinder the development of acquiring competence in English language and/or speech skills, was

unfounded. Barnum (1984) maintained that research recognized the fact that native signers can do well academically if they receive education through the use of natural sign language during the critical age period.

Though the report by the Commission on Education of the Deaf opened the way for the bilingual/bicultural educational approach, Strong (1990) pointed out that the existing educational approaches were also able to help some deaf children to achieve academic success. He added that the new educational (bilingual/bicultural), is another solution for those deaf children who may not achieve academically under present educational system. Liddell and Johnson (1992) replied to the criticisms of "Unlocking the Curriculum" (Johnson, Liddell, & Erting, 1989), which favored the use of ASL as the first language to learn English, and as the language of instruction in all subjects. They stated that they did not intend their model to replace all of the existing educational methods but be included to provide for various needs of deaf children. They felt that any method, which is found to be unsuccessful in providing natural language acquisition and communication should be limited in use or discarded.

With the growing number of deaf superintendents, new information from bilingual researchers, and political pressure from the Deaf community, the bilingual/bicultural educational approach gained ground in deaf education (Nover, 1995). In 1985, the Learning Center for Deaf Children, located in Framingham, Massachusetts, became a bilingual/bicultural school (Small &

Philip, 1991). The Indiana School for the Deaf, located in Indianapolis, Indiana changed to bilingual/Bilingual program in 1990 (Reynolds & Titus, 1991). Under the influence of the publication of "Unlocking the Curriculum" (Johnson, Liddell, & Erting, 1989), the program at California School for the Deaf in Fremont adopted the bilingual/bicultural educational approach as well (Kuntze & Bosso, 1991). Other schools across America and Canada are following the suit. The transformation to a bilingual/bicultural educational approach in these schools was the result of teamwork between Deaf and Hearing staff members, and included the students' parents.

Partly as a result of the criticism received from two federal reports, bilingual/bicultural advocates have come up to the batting plate. Their educational approach is rather new to the field of deaf education. The oral and total communication advocates are looking at them to see if they will make a home run. Perhaps, they will be able to play as teammates and work together in shaping the future of deaf education, thus brightening the future of our deaf children in the world.

Purpose of the Study

Schools mentioned earlier continue to refine their new bilingual/bicultural programs. They may have diverse philosophies of bilingual/bicultural education for deaf students. This study has two purposes: a) to identify the characteristics of their programs, and b) to analyze policies of those schools to seek basic similarities as well as differences in their bilingual/bicultural philosophies if any.

Method

Participants

A total of 12 schools (see Appendix A) from nine states including one in Canada that implemented Bilingual/bicultural programs of the deaf students were selected for the study. They were contacted by phone and all of them agreed to participate in answering the questionnaires (see Appendix B). The questionnaires were sent to them by fax. Follow-up phone calls were carried out as well.

The outcome from the respondents was very positive. A total of 10 (83%) questionnaires were returned, a few with incomplete information. For this paper, the demographics of deaf bilingual/bicultural programs, the roles of American Sign Language (ASL) and English, communication policies, languages in the curriculum, and the program's bilingual/bicultural curriculum were examined.

Results

Demographics of Deaf Bilingual/Bicultural Programs

Program implemented. Based on the data, programs were implemented as early as 1990 and as recent as the fall of 1996. The oldest deaf bilingual/bicultural program that we know of, which was not included in data, was established in 1985. Nine of the ten programs surveyed were established "officially" (as opposed to being experimental or pilot programs). One was in the developmental stage since it was established last year. One program is presently a pilot project and it is not known when it will become an official program.

The results of the survey showed that not all schools offer full academic programs ranging from pre-school to high school. Three of them had only elementary programs and one of these also offered a preschool. Another school had a preschool program off campus but no data were available on this education level.

Student enrollment. The data showed that a total of 1,919 deaf students were enrolled in pre-school through to high school programs. One hundred and fifteen students were reported in pre-school programs, 622 in elementary schools, 379 in middle schools, and 683 in high schools (See Table 1). A certain school, which put middle and high schools together, had 120 students (see Table 1).

Teachers employed. In the total sample of 10 programs, the respondents reported a total of 410 teachers, of whom 176 were deaf. The deaf teachers comprised 43% of the teaching sample. One program stated that its charter required a majority of deaf teachers to be employed and the number of deaf teachers it employed did, in fact, reflect its philosophy. The numbers of deaf and hearing teachers at each educational level were reported in Table 2. It is not known whether the respondents included the teacher aides/assistants in reporting "number of teachers."

Role of American Sign Language (ASL) & English

ASL. This section of the questionnaire focused on the role American Sign Language (ASL) and English played in the school program, mainly from the respondent's perspective. Ten respondents recognized ASL as the language of the school community and as the language of instruction. Additionally,

seven respondents thought ASL should be taught as a subject, two saw ASL as a teaching method to teach English only (See Table 3).

English. Eight respondents considered the role of English to be a language of the school community, and all 10 saw it as being taught as a subject. Only three respondents also recognized it as a language of instruction (see Table 3). All of the respondents strongly agreed that ASL and English are equal but separate languages.

Other communication methods. Eight schools reported not using any other communication methods, such as Signed English or SIMCOM (signing & talking at the same time). One of the eight reported the use of Pidgin Signed English (PSE). Also, one of them indicated that "most people use ASL or SIMCOM with ASL-like vocabulary." Only two schools reported using other communication methods. One respondent mentioned the use of PSE and another reported that some teachers and administrators currently use SIMCOM, as a "contact language", and added that it was not a policy.

ASL, the most appropriate language of the deaf. All of the respondents agreed (and nine strongly agreed) that ASL was the most appropriate and accessible language for deaf children. Eight agreed (and five strongly agreed) that ASL should be the first language for all deaf children, regardless of the degree of hearing loss and family background. Two responded with comments. One expressly stated that "you can't say that ASL 'should be' the first language. ASL by its nature as a visual-gestural language is the most natural first language." The other respondent stated

"we don't believe anyone should do anything. ASL is most accessible because of visual constraints. We bring ASL to your home (hearing parents) and support you in learning it in the context best for families."

Communication Policy

This section included questions to discover what form of communication was expected of teachers and students in their daily interaction in and outside the classroom.

The use of ASL. The survey found that all of the respondents encouraged (and most of them strongly encouraged) the teachers and teacher aides/assistants to use ASL or ASL-like signing when communicating with each other or with the students. In addition, the data showed that all of the programs expected their employees to be proficient in ASL.

The use of SIMCOM or voice communication. Seven of the programs discouraged (and six strongly discouraged) the teachers and teacher aides/assistants from using SIMCOM or voice communication with each other or with students. Two of the programs felt that it would benefit some students, depending on their student needs for auditory and aural support. One reported that "voice communication is used in the Communication Center, at home, with friends." Of 10 programs, six supported allowing the students to use voice communication or SIMCOM. One stated that teachers "accept any means of communication from children." Another commented that "students are free to use whatever they are comfortable with as long as they are respectful of others. They are encouraged to pick a language, or use an interpreter,

write or use spoken English." One respondent stated that the students were allowed to use voice communication or SIMCOM outside of class but were not permitted to use them in class. At one program, the administration was presently seeking consensus on communication and SIMCOM issues.

Communication programs for families. Altogether seven out of ten programs provided communication guidelines/strategies for families. One respondent stated that the program had a "home-based signed language program (ASL) for hearing parents", and another offered ASL workshops and classes to families of students." One of the school programs is planning to provide ASL for parents in the future and plans to develop communication guidelines and strategies as well.

Languages in the Curriculum

Appropriate Model/Teacher. The survey showed that majority of the respondents agreed that the deaf teachers were the most appropriate models/teachers of ASL. They reacted similarly toward hearing teachers in dealing with English. There were two programs that disagreed with this and one was uncertain. When questioned whether or not both deaf and hearing teaches can be appropriate models/teachers of English or ASL, the majority of respondents agreed. Only one disagreed with this view. One mentioned that "it would depend on training."

Teaching of English & ASL. Regarding what approach is being used to teach English, the respondents gave various answers. The programs reported the use of whole language, English as Second Language (ESL) or a combination of whole language and ESL

approaches. One of the programs mentioned the use of a "new language arts curriculum using ASL/English Connection & ESL techniques." Another program added that they were researching innovative approaches.

When questioned whether ASL should be taught as a first or second language for a deaf child, who has English as a first language, the survey showed various responses. Three schools responded, saying that ASL would be taught as a first language. Three other schools stated that ASL was taught as a second language. The rest of the respondents gave their own comments as follows:

> Depend on each student's learning styles (if more "visual" learner, ASL as 1st language);
>
> How is a deaf child taught English as a first language?;
>
> If the child is deaf, I would need to be convinced that he/she truly has English as a first language- is it truly accessible? How?

The last two comments appeared to express that a deaf child would not be able to acquire English as first language naturally. This also seemed to indicate that ASL is a natural language of all deaf children.

English as a subject. Nine of ten programs introduced English a subject at the kindergarten level. One program started English at the pre-school level.

ASL as a subject. Regarding ASL being introduced as a subject, three schools began in high school. One taught ASL as a subject at the elementary level. Four schools began teaching ASL

at the preschool level, and one at the kindergarten level. In addition, one program was planning to begin instruction in ASL as a subject, but had not yet decided at what education level the introduction would occur.

Weight/exposure given to each language. When questioned about the percentage of exposure given to each language when both ASL and English were used, various weights were reported (see Table 4). One reported, "ASL remains a language of instruction while English print increases by age." Another commented by saying that it "depends as the students get older, the percent of English increases." Another commented as follows:

> No guidelines set yet;
>
> Can't answer- it varies;
>
> Depends on individual needs of students;
>
> We don't calculate percentage- ASL is the language of communication and instruction- this is approximate- Hearing children sign ASL approximately 80% of each day. Deaf children [use it] all day- written English is used throughout the day.

Lastly, one commented:

> ASL is the language of instruction here- teachers use ASL "orally". English means reading & writing. We do not, at least at this point, have ASL classes per se. We have double periods of English from the 6th to the 12th grade.

Bilingual/Bicultural Program

Deaf Studies. The survey results showed that five of the schools provided Deaf Studies as part of their curriculum for

grades K-12 and the other five were developing it (see Table 5).

Hearing culture. Of the ten schools surveyed, seven were providing a study of hearing culture as part of their curriculum and three were developing it (see Table 5).

Bilingual/bicultural curriculum. The data showed that four schools presently have bilingual-bicultural curriculum for grades K-12, whereas four others were in the process of curriculum development (see Table 5). The grades offering the bilingual/bicultural curriculum varied, ranging from pre-school to 12th grade. One program did not have a bilingual/bicultural curriculum and the respondent stated "we follow the State Curricula with adaptations as needed (as closely as possible)."

Summary and Discussion

Ten bilingual/bicultural programs of the deaf were surveyed. The programs were established between 1990 and the fall of 1996 and most of them identified themselves as official programs. A total of 1,919 students in preschool through to high school were enrolled in these programs. The programs employed 410 teachers. The respondents did not fully report the number of deaf and hearing teacher aides/assistants. This may need to be more clearly stated in a future survey in order to get accurate data. A total of 176 (43%) of the teachers were deaf. This is a large number compared with the 42% reported in 1870 before the effects of the Milan Congress descended (Jones, 1918).

The survey found that all programs recognized American Sign Language (ASL) and English as equal but separate languages and both were taught as subjects as well. Both languages were

considered the languages of the school community. With the exception of one program that offer English as a subject at the preschool level, all programs began teaching English at the kindergarten level. Many of these programs were using different approaches to teach English; such as, whole language, English as Second Language (ESL), or a combination of both approaches. In addition, some comments indicated that they were continuing a search for innovative ways to teach English. The results of this study indicate that the fear that English would be minimized or excluded in the bilingual/bicultural programs is unfounded.

All programs recognized ASL as the most appropriate and accessible language for deaf children and used it as the language of instruction. Nearly all respondents felt that all deaf children, regardless the degree of hearing loss and family background, should have ASL as their first language. Interestingly, two commented that we cannot say that ASL "should be" the first language. They considered it to be a natural, visual/spatial language of deaf children. The respondents were divided when questioned whether ASL should be taught as a first or second language for a deaf child who had English as first language. Some doubted that English could ever be learned by a deaf child as a first language. Those who were strongly in favor of teaching ASL as a first language, presumably believed that the

majority of late deafened children are able to acquire ASL proficiently. Most of the programs discouraged their teachers and teacher aides/assistants from using SIMCOM or voice communication with each other and with the students. A few allowed it to benefit some students for their auditory needs. This showed their belief that ASL provided their students a full access to information being taught in all subjects. As for the student communication, they allowed them to use whatever communication modes they felt comfortable with.

All respondents except one felt that both deaf and hearing teachers could be appropriate models/teachers to teach English or ASL. However, all programs recognized deaf teachers as the most appropriate models/teachers to teach ASL. Six of them stated that hearing teachers were the most appropriate models/teacher to teach English language. Only two respondents disagreed with this view. They obviously did not agree that the teaching of English should be limited to hearing teachers only. I would assume that they considered deaf teachers, who were thoroughly familiar with English, able to teach it well through their proficiency in ASL. This also might indicate the opinion that a teacher would need to be proficient in both languages before he/she could teach.

All of the programs had or were developing Deaf Studies, the

study of hearing culture, and a bilingual/bicultural curriculum. One program had to comply with its state curricula with some adaptations. It was rather a surprise to see them include the study of hearing culture.

The current study points to areas where future research needs to be done. One study would be to find out how the teaching of ASL is carried out with a deaf child who had English as first language. Another study would be needed to find out how English is being taught and in what forms since the respondents gave various comments on how much weight/exposure they gave to each language, ASL and English. Since all programs provided or were developing a study of hearing culture for their curriculum, further research is needed to discover its contents. Lastly, an additional study would focus on discovering who a teacher of English should be (deaf or hearing) and why, since two respondents disagreed with the view that hearing teachers are the most appropriate model to teach English.

Overall, we need to be aware that since most of the bilingual/bicultural programs are rather new, we would expect them to go through a slow transformation while refining their programs' philosophies and characteristics. The bilingual/bicultural approach is controversial and needs time to

gain public approval from parents, educators, and legislators. It will take between 10 to 20 years before we see any actual results, and know whether or not the approach is a blessing or a curse for deaf children.

References

Barnum, M. (1984). In support of bilingual/bicultural education for deaf children. American Annals of the Deaf, 129(5), 404-408.

Commission on Education of the Deaf. (1988). Toward Equality. A Report to the President and the Congress of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 49, 222-251.

Gannon, J.R. (1981). Deaf Heritage: A Narrative History of Deaf America. Silver Spring, Md.: National Association of the Deaf.

Hurwitz, T.A. (1987). Education, History. In Gallaudet Encyclopedia of Deaf People and Deafness, Vol. 1., 360-365. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jensema, C.J. & Trybus, R.J. (1978). Communication Patterns and Educational Achievement of Hearing-impaired Students. Washington, DC: Office of Demographic Studies, Gallaudet College.

Johnson, R.E., Liddell, S.K., and Erting, C.J. (1989). Unlocking the curriculum: Principles for achieving access in deaf education. Gallaudet Research Institute Working Paper 89(3). Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University.

Jones, J.W. (1918). One hundred years of history in the education of the deaf in America and its present status. American Annals of the Deaf, 63(1), 1-47.

Kuntze, M. & Bosso, E.. (1991) Consciousness-raising effort at California School for the Deaf, Fremont. In CAID's Deaf Studies Signewsletter. Winter 1991. Vol. 6(1), p. 6,7.

Liddell, S. & Johnson, R. (1992). Toward theoretically sound practices in deaf education. In Conference Proceedings: Bilingual Considerations in the Education of Deaf Students: ASL and English. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University.

Lane, H. (1990). Bilingual education for asl-using children. In Garretson, Mervin D. (Ed). A Deaf American Monograph Vol.40. Washington, D.C.: St. Mary's Press, 78-85.

Lou, M.W. (1988). The history of the education of the deaf in the United States. In Michael Strong (Ed.) Language Learning and Deafness. New York: Cambridge University Press, 75-98.

Moores, D.F. (1987). Educating the Deaf Psychology, Principles, and Practices. (3rd Edition). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Nover, S.M. (1995). Politics and language: American Sign Language and English in deaf education. In Lucas, C. (Ed) Sociolinguistics in Deaf Communities. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University, p. 109-153.

Paul, P.V. (1988). American Sign Language and English: a bilingual minority-language immersion program. CAID-News 'N' Notes. Washington, D.C.: Conference of American Instructors of the Deaf.

Paul, P.V. & Quigley, S.P. (1994). Language and Deafness. San Diego, California: Singular Publishing Group, Inc.

Reynolds, D. & Titus, A. (1991). The grassroot effort paid off at the Indiana School for the Deaf. In CAID's Deaf Studies Signewsletter. Winter 1991, Vol. 6(1), p.3,4.

Scouten, E.L. (1984). Turning Points in the Education of Deaf People. Danville, Ill: The Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Small, A. & Philip, M. (1991). The path to bilingualism and biculturalism at the learning center for deaf children. In CAID's Deaf Studies Signewsletter. Winter 1991, Vol. 6(1), p.4, 5.

Stewart, D.A (1993). Bi-Bi to MCE? American Annals of the Deaf, 138(4), 331-337.

Swisher, M.V. (1989). The language-learning situation of deaf students. TESOL Quarterly (23). No.2. June 1989.

Strong, M. (1988). A bilingual approach to educating deaf children: ASL and English. In Michael Strong (Ed.) Language Learning and Deafness. New York: Cambridge University Press, 113-129.

Strong, M. (1990). Bilingualism and deaf children. In Garretson, Mervin D.(Ed). A Deaf American Monograph Vol. 40. Washington, D.C.: St. Mary's Press, 125-127.

Stuckless, E.R. & J. W. Birch. (1966). The influence of early manual communication on the linguistic development of deaf children. American Annals of the Deaf, 111, 452-460, 499-504.

Valli, C. & Lucas, C. (1992). Linguistics of American Sign Language. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Van Cleve, J.V.& Crouch, B.A.(1989). A Place of Their Own. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Appendix A

Questionnaire was sent to the following schools as listed below:

Arizona

1. Arizona School for the Deaf Accepted____ Declined____ Received____
P.O. Box 85000 520/770-3738 (V/T)
Tucson, AZ 85754 520/770-3711 (F)

Person to contact: Pat McAnally

2. The Laurent Clerc Elementary School Accepted____ Declined____ Received____
740 E. Speedway Blvd. 520/798-0847 (V/T)
Tucson, Arizona 85719 520/798-0862 (F)

Person to contact: Cindy Neuroth-Gimbrone (Executive Director/Teacher) Cng@theriver.com

3. **California** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____

California School for the Deaf 510/794-3685 (V/T)
39350 Gallaudet Drive 510/794-2409 (F)
Fremont, CA 94538

Person to contact: Dee Kennedy 510/794-3730 Secretary 510/794-3734
Fax: Same number

4. **Indiana** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____

Indiana School for the Deaf 317/924-4374 (V/T)
1200 East 42nd Street 317/923-2853 (F)
Indianapolis, IN 46205-2099

Person to contact: Diane Hazel Jones (Family Resource Coordinator) 317/924-8418 (V/T)
Fax: Same number

5. **Maryland** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____

Maryland School for the Deaf 301/620-8500 (V/T)
101 Clarke Place, P.O. Box 250 301/620-8575 (F)
Frederick, MD 21705

Person to contact: Vicki Grossinger 301/620-8534 Fax: Same number

6. **Massachusetts** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____

The Learning Center for Deaf Children 508/879-5110 (V/T)
848 Central Street 508/875-9203 (F)
Framingham, MA 01701-4815
Person to Contact: Marie Phillip 617/353-9480 Fax: 617/323-7215

7. **Minnesota** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____

Metro Deaf School 612/224-3995
289 East Fifth Street, Suite 102 612/224-5596 (F)
St. Paul, MN 55101

Person to contact: Ann Mayes

8. **New York** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____

Cleary School for the Deaf 516/588-0530 (V/T)
301 Smithtown Boulevard 516/588-0016 (F)
Nesconset, NY 11767

Person to contact: Paul Roult 516/543-5942 (H) Fax: 516/543-0729

9. **Ontario, Canada** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____
Ernest C. Drury School for the Deaf 905/878-2851 (V)
255 Ontario Street South 905/878-7195 (T)
Milton, Ontario L9T 2M5 905/878-1354 (F)

Person to contact: Anita Small

Texas

10. Texas School for the Deaf Accepted____ Declined____ Received____
1102 S. Congress Avenue 512/442-7821
P.O. Box 3538 512/440-5343 (F)
Austin, TX 78764

Person to contact: Claire Bugen Asst. Supt. 512/462-5401 Fax: 512/462-5313

11. Brazo Valley Regional Day School Program for the Deaf Accepted____ Received____
101 North Texas Avenue Declined____
Bryan, Texas 77803

Person to contact: Connie Ferguson 409/361-5382 Fax: 409/823-0352

12. **Wisconsin** Accepted____ Declined____ Received____

Wisconsin School for the Deaf 414/728-7120 (V/T)
309 West Walworth Avenue 414/728-7160 (F)
Delavan, WI 53115

Person to contact: Kathryn Harbison Fax: 414/728-7129

Appendix B

Please print the name of your institution_____

Name and title of the person completing this questionnaire:
Name_____ Title_____

A. General Information

1. The Deaf Bilingual/Bicultural program was implemented in year 19____.

2. The Deaf Bilingual/Bicultural program is
____an official program ____an experimental program a pilot project until year _____.

3. Number of students in Preschool____ Elementary____ Middle School____ High School ____

4. Number of teachers, and teacher aides/ assistants work with deaf students.

Preschool----------Deaf____ Hearing____ Middle School-----Deaf____ Hearing ____
Elementary--------Deaf____ Hearing____ High School--------Deaf____ Hearing____

Comments:_____
_____
_____

B. Role of American Sign Language (ASL) & English

1. What is the role of ASL and English in the curriculum? Check as many as necessary.

ASL is
____ a language of school community.
____ a teaching method to teach English only.
____ taught as a subject.
____ a language of instruction.

English is
____ a language of school community.
____ taught as a subject
____ a language of instruction

2. ASL and English are equal but separate languages.
Strongly agree____ Agree____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree____ Not sure____

3. Are there any communication methods used in your school, such as Signed English or SIMCOM?
Yes___ No____

If yes, what communication methods are used?_____

4. American Sign Language (ASL) is considered to be the most appropriate and accessible language for Deaf children?
Strongly agree____ Agree____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree____ Not sure____

5. ASL should be the first language for all Deaf children, regardless of degree of hearing loss and family background.
   Strongly agree____ Agree____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree____ Not sure____

Comments:_____
_____
_____

C. Communication Policy

1. Teachers and teacher aides/ assistants are encouraged to communicate with students.

   Using ASL or ASL-like signing:
   Strongly encourage____ Encourage____ Discourage____ Strongly discourage____

   Using of SIMCOM (signing & talking at the same time):
   Strongly encourage____ Encourage____ Discourage____ Strongly discourage____

2. Communication between teacher and teacher-aide/assistant in class.

   Using ASL or ASL-like signing:
   Strongly encourage____ Encourage____ Discourage____ Strongly discourage____

   Using of SIMCOM or voice communication:
   Strongly encourage____ Encourage____ Discourage____ Strongly discourage____

3. Are students discouraged from using voice communication or SIMCOM?
   Strongly encourage____ Encourage____ Discourage____ Strongly discourage____

4. Proficiency in ASL is expected of employees.
   Strongly encourage____ Encourage____ Discourage____ Strongly discourage____

5. Do you provide communication guidelines/strategies for families?
   Yes____ No____

   Comments_____
   _____
   _____

D. Language and the Curriculum

1. Deaf teachers are the most appropriate models/teachers of ASL.
   Strongly agree____ Agree____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree____ Not sure____

2. Hearing teachers are the most appropriate models/teachers of English.
   Strongly agree____ Agree____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree____ Not sure____

3. Both Deaf and Hearing teachers can be appropriate models/teachers of English or ASL.
   Strongly agree____ Agree____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree____ Not sure____

4. What approach is being used to teach English? (ESL, Whole Language, etc.)

_____

5. If a child has English as first language, ASL will
____be taught as second language. _____still be taught as first language.

6. At what grade level is English as a subject introduced?_____

7. At what grade level is ASL as a subject introduced?_____

8. When both ASL and English are used, how much weight/exposure is given to each language?
50% ASL/ 50% English? 75/25?

	ASL	English		ASL	English		ASL	English		ASL	English
Preschool	____	/____	Elementary	____	/____	Middle	____	/____	High School	____	/____

Comments_____
_____
_____

E. Bilingual/Bicultural Program

1. Is Deaf Studies part of the curriculum for grades K-12?
Yes____ is being developed____ No____

2. Study of hearing culture included? Yes____ Is being developed____ No____

3. Has a bilingual-bicultural curriculum been developed for use in grades K-12?
Yes___ is being developed____ No____

If yes, which grades?_____

Comments_____
_____
_____

Table 1

Numbers of deaf & hearing teachers employed (N= 410)

	Teachers	
Program	Deaf	Hearing
Pre-School	23	13
Elementary School	59	72
Middle School	30	45
High School	50	75
*Middle & High School	14	29
Total	176 (43%)	234 (57%)

* In a certain school, both programs were combined together.

Table 2

Roles of ASL & English in the curriculum (N= 10)

	ASL	English
Language of school community	10	8
Language of instruction	10	3
Taught as subject	7	10
Method to teach English only	2	N/A

Table 3

Weight/exposure given to each language (N= 6)

Program	Percentage Range of ASL	Percentage Range of English
Pre-School	70-90%	10-25%
Elementary School	60-75%	25-40%
Middle School	50-63%	37-50%
High School	50-60%	40-50%

Table 4

Bilingual/bicultural program (N= 10)

Questions	Responses		
	Yes	Being Developed	No
Is Deaf Studies part of the curriculum for grades K-12?	5	5	0
Study of hearing culture included?	7	3	0
Has a bilingual/bicultural curriculum been developed for use in K-12?	*4	4	1

*The respondent indicated "No" but this accompanying information showed that the answer should have been 'Yes" because grade data was included.